



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

HISTOIRE DE L'ART DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ par GEORGES PERROT et CHARLES CHAPIEZ. Tome IV. JUDÉE—SARDAIGNE—SYRIE—CAPPADOCE : contenant 395 gravures, *etc.* 4to, pp. 829. Paris, 1887, Hachette.

Not the least of the merits of M. Perrot's great history is the pains taken to throw light on some of the most obscure and least studied developments of ancient art and archæology. The last volume issued, which lies before us, deals almost entirely with obscure or little-known topics—Sardinia, Judæa, the Hittites—the first, so unattractive as to have appealed to none but a few specialists; the second, so slightly based on facts as to be an ever-fertile field for hypothesis and for fancy; the third, dealing with groups of monuments to which attention has been called only within the last few years, and of the origin, race and history of whose builders we know nothing. It is a far greater task on the resources of an author to deal with such intricate problems as are raised by these varied themes than to treat of a subject like Egyptian or Greek art in which history, religion, language, and monuments contribute their quota of assistance.

Sardinia.—In his volumes on Phœnicia, Perrot had frequently cited objects found in Sardinian tombs; but these nekropoleis with Phœnician contents are invariably along the seacoast. The native population of the interior remained unsubjected to any foreign dominion, until the Romans gained over it a series of dearly bought victories. The monuments and various products of the industrial arts that are found in this region, and which may easily be distinguished from those of the Roman period, show traces of Phœnician influence, but also form a whole to which we must allow an indubitable originality, barbarous though it be. M. Perrot gives great weight to a tradition according to which the first inhabitants of Sardinia came from Africa: they are identical with the *Shardana* of Egyptian monuments, and probably came from Asia Minor, joining in the attack on Egypt, after the failure of which they passed along the coast of Africa until they reached the point opposite Sardinia.

The typical monuments of Sardinia are the circular buildings called, by the natives, *nouraghes*. They are concisely described in the following words: "The nouraghe is a tower in the shape of a truncated cone, which probably terminated in a sort of terrace: it is built of blocks that are often enormous, especially at the base of the monument, and which diminish in

size as they rise from the ground." The blocks are generally unhewn and are never joined with mortar. A single low door leads into a narrow passage which conducts to a chamber, sometimes circular, sometimes elliptical, and often 6 or 7 metres high, vaulted with a pointed dome formed by the projection of the successive stone-courses, as in the well-known *tholoi* of Greece and in some of the "Pelasgic" tombs of Italy. Sometimes a second story, with another dome, rises over the first, and a staircase leads to the summit. The *nouraghes* vary greatly in plan. Sometimes they are grouped so as apparently to form a system of defensive towers. Some consist of many chambers and have internal courts enclosed between a tall central structure and flanking towers. M. Perrot's conclusion is that the *nouraghes* were neither tombs nor temples, but forts where the Sardinians stored their valuables, and where they sought refuge in times of danger; and that the development of this idea can be followed in its various stages from the simple single *nouraghe* to the later and more complicated structures. He cites most appositely a passage from a work falsely attributed to Aristotle: "There are, it is said, in the island of Sardinia, buildings erected in the old Greek style; among other beautiful constructions, there are vaults arranged so as to present the most beautiful proportions." Certainly this cannot but refer to the *nouraghes* which are thus compared to the "Homeric" constructions of Greece. The *talayot* of the Balearic isles are similar constructions. Of almost equal interest are the tombs of Sardinia, which consist of three parts—a hemicycle; then a high stele; and finally a long, narrow trench, like the "Celtic" "covered alley."

In the plastic arts the Sardinians have left us a multitude of small bronzes—statuettes of men or animals, of very rude workmanship, and interesting mainly for their costume and attributes, for they seem to be faithful representations of the inhabitants. The largest series is that of warriors: some with short swords, others with long swords; a still larger number, archers. These statuettes were all mounted on blocks of trachyte, and put in hiding-places. There follows a study of metallurgy among the Sardinians, and an attempt to reconstitute their arms and utensils.

M. Perrot regards the *nouraghes* as erected, by invading colonists from the S. W. of the island, against the incursions of the barbarous native tribes whom they gradually confined, by successive advances, to the more mountainous districts; although he weakens this hypothesis by admitting that but little of the known remains can be attributed to a period anterior to the Carthaginian conquest, and that they show a culture subordinate to and derived from the Punic.

Judaea.—In treating of the chapters devoted to the archæology of the Hebrews, it is hardly possible to avoid taking exception, at once, to M. Perrot's fundamental idea, that there was no development of art of any

sort among the Hebrews ; but that what they had was purely Phœnician. He asserts that, *as long as they lived on the soil of Judæa as a nation, the Jews were but a people of shepherds, land-laborers, and soldiers ; they hardly possessed artisans for the exercise of those very simple trades that are absolutely necessary to any society with pretensions to a civilized life ; and they even borrowed the greater part of their implements and their arms from their more advanced neighbors, the Philistines and especially the Phœnicians. This continued until the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, up to the moment when the so-called captivity of Babylon, by dispersing the Jews, and obliging them to live among strangers, opened to them new ways and began to awaken among them aptitudes and tastes which would not have been in the least suspected from their past.* It is hardly necessary to take up the gauntlet against such prejudiced and sweeping unfounded assertions, which would make a *tabula rasa* of Jewish literature and history in order to reconstruct it out of the figment of a universal Phœnicomania. A people which could produce the greatest monuments of Oriental literature, possessed such a genius for government that it could preserve its independence for so many centuries against a host of powerful enemies, was prominent in poetry and music, and wrought out a language far more subtle, imaginative, and perfect than any other of Western Asia, is far more likely, *prima facie*, to possess artistic capabilities than an eclectic nation like the Phœnicians, a nation of merchants, without literature, without cohesion, without originality, with a debased religion, borrowed customs and a venal character.

The art which created the temple of Solomon was but an art of secondary importance, says M. Perrot—Phœnician art, which cannot be compared to any of the great developments of ancient or Christian architecture. This being the case, it is hardly possible to justify the interminable length of his study of the temple, spread over more than two hundred pages. The writer himself seeks to explain it by making an admission which contradicts the barbarism which he attributed to the Jews, a few pages before : “ Jerusalem and Athens are the two real capitals of the ancient world.” One stops to wonder how the capital of a tribe of mere shepherds, field-laborers and soldiers could play such a role ! M. Perrot is an ardent disciple of the German rationalistic critics, and in a discursive preliminary chapter, in which he undertakes to give a concentrated history of the Jews, he develops the nomad question with considerable fullness. In chapter II, on *the history of the Temple*, there is : (1) a study on the topography of Jerusalem in ancient times ; (2) a description of Mt. Moriah ; (3) the different kinds of construction of the enceinte and the architectural forms inserted in them, in which a careful study is made of the remaining portions of the wall, of the substructures and caves, and an account of the history of the Temple in its various transformations, including a detailed contradiction of De

Saulcy's theories. The third chapter treats of *the documents to be consulted and the method to be followed in attempting a restoration of the Temple*. Starting from the information gained in the preceding chapter on the position, foundations, arched galleries and other substructures of the Temple, M. Perrot here studies the texts that are of some assistance in attempting a restoration—*Kings, Chronicles, Ezekiel, Josephus, the Targumim and the Talmud*: he founds himself mainly on the description in *Ezekiel*, which is to form the basis of his restoration. Doubtless, it will take the reader some time to thoroughly apprehend the brilliant notion of M. Perrot, to construct an imaginary temple from a visionary model. His vision is not to restore the temple of Solomon, *a building of small dimensions which played in the religious life of Israel but a secondary role; nor yet the temple destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, that of the last Kings of Judah, a construction already far more complicated, but of whose irregular and confused arrangement we know but little; it is the temple of Ezekiel, a unique and singular combination of reality and fiction, the building which the prophet presents to his compatriots as the consolation and revanche for the evils of the past, etc.* It sounds more like the enterprise of a Knight-errant, than a serious archæological work, to base an appreciation of Jewish art almost entirely on the reconstitution of a building that never existed. The subject of the following chapter is *The Temple of Ezekiel*. Within a square plan of 500 cubits M. Perrot distributes the various buildings and courts, arranging them in relation to a subdivision of the entire ground-plan into ten small squares per side, or a hundred squares in all, each measuring 50 cubits per side. Then are fixed the ground dimensions and positions of the six portals, the temple and its three large dependencies.

It is certainly a most interesting, and, in a certain way, valuable piece of work to reconstruct this group of buildings, and we follow with curiosity the text as one after another the dimensions and relations of the different parts of the group are discussed, far more successfully and technically than they have ever been before. The result of the reconstitution is certainly imposing. We cannot here attempt to challenge its correctness in certain details. There follows a chapter on the furniture of the temple: the columns Iakin and Boaz, carefully restored, the brazen sea, the basins, *etc.* Leaving the Temple, M. Perrot continues his investigations on Jewish Sepulchral architecture, and assigns a late date to nearly all the rock-cut tombs hitherto known, believing, as he does, that none are earlier than the Asmonæan or Idumæan dynasties, with the exception of a simple tomb of Egyptianizing character, called "the monolith of Siloam." According to him, the Jewish tomb before the exile was but a secondary and inferior form of the Phœnician tomb, while in the period preceding the Roman conquest the influence of Hellenistic architectural forms was felt, producing such works as the

Tomb of Absalom. As regards secondary forms of religious architecture, M. Perrot studies the high-places, or *bamoth*, and identifies them with existing primitive remains of dolmens, menhirs, and other combinations of rude uncut stones. In speaking (p. 168) of a very primitive archway, under "the arch of Robinson," found by the English explorers in the valley of the Tyropœon (Jerusalem), M. P. considers it to be an early bridge between the western hill and that of the temple: "This first bridge could then belong only to the time of the Kings of Judah, and might date back even to Solomon himself. Pupils of the Egyptians and Assyrians, the Phoenicians, masters of the Jews, were acquainted with the principle of the vault; they may have applied it here as early as the tenth century." I am not aware of a single instance of early Phoenician architecture in which either the vault or the arch is used. M. Perrot should inform us what basis he has for this assumption. No grounds for it can be found even in his own volume on Phœnicia. Would it not be more reasonable to assume this early arch to be a remnant of a distinctively Hebrew architecture?

The Hittites.—These final chapters, treating of the early civilization of Northern Syria and Kappadokia, are the most important in this volume, and they give a far better rounded and more probable view of the subject than Wright's volume (*The Empire of the Hittites*). M. Perrot does not adopt the attractive theory of a homogeneous Hittite Empire, extending over Syria and part of Asia Minor, but agrees with Hirschfeld and others in believing that it was only on great occasions, like the wars with Egypt, that a union was effected, and that otherwise the Hittites of Syria even were divided into a number of small independent states, whose relations with their brethren of Kappadokia and other parts of Asia Minor, were but loose and unimportant. The author's theory is that the current of Hittite emigration was not from Asia Minor to Syria but the reverse. A chapter is devoted to the recent discoveries in Northern Syria, at Hamath, Jerablûs, etc., and in Eastern Asia Minor; to the history of the Hittites from Biblical, Egyptian, and Assyrian documents; and to Hittite hieroglyphs. The following chapter deals with the Eastern Hittites, those of Northern Syria. In his study of the meagre remains of Hittite architecture in this region, the ruins of Jerablûs=Carchamish and of Sindjirli furnish the main materials, where are still to be traced ruins of palaces not far different, on a small scale, from those of Assyria. The only building thus far known which may have had a religious character is the strange enclosure at Tarsos, called the *Deunuk-tach*, evidently a pre-Hellenic building. A very complete catalogue of monumental Hittite sculpture is given, and the early style is distinguished from that which shows the influence of Assyria—a difference shown even in the style of costume. A votive character is attributed to the numerous stelai with basreliefs which represent either offerings to some divinity or funeral banquets.

In Asia Minor, the seat of the Western Hittites, the remains are in a far better state of preservation : the sculptures, instead of being on movable slabs and stelai, are generally cut in the virgin rock. Historically speaking, M. Perrot remarks, "Hittites of the right bank of the Halys, Phrygians established near the sources of the Sangarios and the Maiandros, Lydians fixed on the lower course of the Hermos, these three peoples succeed one another, in space as in time, on what may be called the great axis of the peninsula and the main current of its history." In a single canton of ancient Kappadokia, the Pteria of Herodotos, are grouped the most important Hittite monuments of Asia Minor—those of Boghaz-keui and Eujuk. Everything at Boghaz-keui is attributed to a period anterior to Kroisos, who took the capital of the Pterians. Here are the ruins of two palaces, one of which was perhaps the summer residence, the other the winter palace, of the reigning prince, who was at the time of Kroisos a vassal of the king of the Medes. The city itself has, according to M. P., a perimeter of between 5 and 6 kilometres, and was defended by two strong citadels, most important specimens of primitive but skilful military architecture. The third and most interesting part is the sanctuary cut out of the rocks of Iasili-Kaïa—an open-air temple for great assemblies, whose natural walls are covered with long processions in relief. Five hours to the N. E. are the ruins of the palace of Eujuk, built on the plan of the Ninevite palaces and probably earlier in date than that of Boghaz-keui: the religious basreliefs with which it is adorned lead M. Perrot to conjecture that it was the palace not of a king but of the high-priest. Another chapter is given to the Hittite art to the north of the Tauros and this side of the Halys—in Phrygia, Lykaonia and Lydia.

M. Perrot is not so happy in his treatment of the industrial arts among the Hittites. He makes no use of Assyrian inscriptions which mention the many interesting objects presented as tribute or taken in battle from the Hittites by the Assyrian kings during the ninth and eighth centuries. The three bronzes which are published as Hittite seem, in their elongated forms, to present but few analogies to the rock-cut sculptures. The pages devoted to glyptics are very insufficient as an enumeration of monuments. Only a few examples are cited among the many that might have been. Considerable skill is shown in the general treatment of Hittite archæology, which is still in a state of infancy, owing to the fact that no excavations have yet been attempted, and that no progress has been made in the decipherment of the inscriptions. Perhaps it is to be regretted that so much topographic, geographic, and historic material is added, sometimes irrelevantly, to the distinctively archæological background.

A. L. FROTHINGHAM, JR.